REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 4, 5, and 16 has been amended. Claim 17 has been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-17 are pending and under consideration.

Non-Prior Art Rejection

Item 6 on page 2 of the Office Action rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for failing to claim statutory subject matter. In particular, the Office Action stated "the claim does not set forth any physical articles or objects to constitute a machine" in the last paragraph of page 2. However, the specification describes "input part 301 such as an input device (e.g., a microphone, a keyboard, etc.)" on page 9, lines 19-20, and "dialog agents stored in the available dialog agent identification information storing part 1002" on page 16, lines 20-21. Additionally, in FIG. 17, "The data is read by the computer 173, for example, when the dialog control system of the present invention is used" on page 22, line 7-8. One skilled in the art would recognize the features described in claim 1 as the dialog control part, at lines 4-7, correspond to computer 173 in FIG. 17. Therefore it is submitted that claim 1 and claims 2-14, which depend therefore, recites structure sufficient to constitute statutory subject matter and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 16 has been amended to recited " A computer readable storage for controlling a computer box storing a method executable by the computer, comprising" at lines 1-2. It is submitted that claim 16 recites statutory subject matter, in accordance with section 2106 of the Manual for Patent Examining Procedure. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Prior Art Rejections:

In the Office Action, at page 4 numbered paragraph 10, claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 in view of Hayes-Roth (U.S. Publication 2002/0005865). This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claims 1 recites "the dialog control part inquires about processable information *with respect to the plurality of dialog agents*, [and] stores the processable information" (emphasis added) at lines 8-10. Thus, the dialog control part communicates with more than on dialog agent. Page 5 of the Office Action cites "track and store various items of information" in paragraph [0144] as anticipating lines 8-10 of claim 1. Nothing was cited in Hayes-Roth that describes a "plurality of dialog agents" (line 8) or storage of "processable

information" (lines 8-9).

Furthermore, the specification, on page 10 at lines 18-19, states "Herein, the processable information refers to information required for the dialog agent to generate a response using input information." Nothing has been cited in Hayes-Roth that meets the definition of "processable information" as provided in the specification.

In view of the above, it is submitted that claim 1, as well as claims 2-14 that depend therefrom, are patentably distinguishable over Hayes-Roth.

Dependent claims 4 and 5 have been amended to recite "the selection priority of the dialog agent is automatically updated in accordance with a use frequency of the dialog agent" and are supported by page 15 of the specification, lines 6-13. Nothing has been cited in Hayes-Roth that discusses "use frequency of the dialog agent" as recited in lines 2-3 of claims 4 and 5. Therefore, for the reasons discussed above, it is submitted that claims 4 and 5 are further patentably distinguishable over Hayes-Roth.

Independent claim 15 recites "inquiring about processable information with respect to a plurality of dialog agents making responses corresponding to input information, and storing obtained processable information" at lines 2-4. Page 11, lines 5-6, of the Office Actions cites "an agent Izzy based on values of two state variables, IZZY MOOD and USER INPUT" in paragraph [0045] of Hayes-Roth and "stores content in a database" in paragraph [0064] as anticipating lines 2-4 of claim 15. As stated above, in reference to claim 1, nothing was cited in Hayes-Roth that describes a "plurality of dialog agents" (line 2) or storage of "processable information" (lines 3-4). Therefore, it is submitted that claim 15 is patentably distinguishable over Hayes-Roth.

Independent claim 16 recites "inquiring about processable information with respect to a plurality of dialog agents making responses corresponding to input information, and storing obtained processable information" at lines 4-6. The last three lines of page 11 in the Office Action cites "identifies a potential context of an agent to an author" in paragraph [0064] of Hayes-Roth and "the content information" in paragraph [0038] as anticipating lines 4-6 of claim 16. As stated above, in reference to claim 1, nothing was cited in Hayes-Roth that describes a "plurality of dialog agents" (line 3) or storage of "processable information" (lines 4-5). Therefore, it is submitted that claim 15 is patentably distinguishable over Hayes-Roth.

New claim 17 recites "querying a plurality of dialog agents to determine what input parameters each dialog agent requires and storing the input parameters" at lines 2-3. For the reasons discussed above, it is submitted that claim 17 is patentably distinguishable over Hayes-Roth.

Summary:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 06/21/07

By: David E. Moore
Registration No. 59,047

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501